

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/696,958	Applicant(s) CLINCH ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3)_____.

(2) Jim OMalley. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 19 June 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anderson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A..

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant called, in an effort to wrap up the case expeditiously, to propose wording to allow the case to read over Anderson. Several calls back and forth ensued. Applicant called to confirm that inventor approved adding "--and generally in a perpendicular direction--" to independent claims after "which extends outwardly" when describing the protrusion and examiner agreed to do as an examiner's amendment. Additional calls on June 20 confirmed that the embodiment shown in Figs 13-21 are not being claimed. Examiner agreed to rejoin the restricted method claims 62 and 63, in that requiring a separate application for a method requiring such specific structure seems redundant. Claim 64 is cancelled as drawn to Figs 13-21. Finally, examiner agreed to change "halves" in claims 62 and 63 to "--segments--"; since support in spec is in original claim 4 and the drawings as filed. .